

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,608	0	8/15/2001	L. Michael Maritzen	80398.P428	1723
8791	7590 12/17/2004			EXAMINER	
BLAKELY 12400 WILS		OFF TAYLOR &	HOLZEN, STEPHEN A		
SEVENTH I		OLL VAID	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LOS ANGE	LES, CA	90025-1030	3644		
				DATE MAILED: 12/17/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/930,608	MARITZEN ET AL.	Op
\ \	Examiner	Art Unit	1
	Stephen A. Holzen	3644	
THE MAIL INC DATE of this assumption		d. d	

THE REPLY FILED 26 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a

final rejection under 37 CFR 1.	.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed imely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal f	amendment which places the application in fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued
	PERIOD FOR REPLY [check eith	her a) or b)]
	months from the mailing date of the final rejec	
event, however, will the statu	itory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS fro	he date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no om the mailing date of the final rejection. O MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
have been filed is the date for purposes a 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the	of determining the period of extension and the corresp he expiration date of the shortened statutory period for d by the Office later than three months after the mailing	ion under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee conding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in g date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any
	filed on Appellant's Brief must be extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to a	
2. The proposed amendme	ent(s) will not be entered because:	
(a) They raise new issue	es that would require further consideration	n and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue	of new matter (see Note below);	
(c) they are not deemed issues for appeal; a		or appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present addition	onal claims without canceling a correspon	nding number of finally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has over	ercome the following rejection(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amer canceling the non-allow:		submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment
	exhibit, or c)⊠ request for reconsideratio for allowance because: <u>See Continuation S</u>	on has been considered but does NOT place the heet.
6. The affidavit or exhibit w raised by the Examiner		irected SOLELY to issues which were newly
	the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not new or amended claims would be rejected	t be entered or b)□ will be entered and an d is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s	s) is (or will be) as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:	·	
Claim(s) rejected:	-	
Claim(s) withdrawn from		
8. The drawing correction f	iled on is a) _ approved or b) [disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449	9) Paper No(s)
10. Other:		
		TERI PHAM LUU SUPERVISORY

⁻⁻The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the applicant's arguments are more specific than the claim language allows for. The applicant has asserted that credit cards numbers reveal the identity of the party using those numbers. However the credit card numbers only reveal an account with a credit card company. Furthermore, the credit card could be used by a person other than the holder of the credit card account. Therefor the 102 and 103 rejections of claims 2-7, 9-13 and 20-24 over stand, where the claimed transaction device does not identify the party using the device, but only the account numbers of the device.